

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,569	12/22/2003	Jeffrey D. Rupp	FGT 1852 PA	1568
28549	7590 11/01/2005		EXAMINER	
KEVIN G. MIERZWA			HERNANDEZ, OLGA	
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C. 28333 TELEGRAPH ROAD, SUITE 250		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034			2144	
			DATE MAILED: 11/01/2004	ξ

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/707,569	RUPP, JEFFREY D.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Olga Hernandez	2144			
	MAILING DATE of this communication a		correspondence address			
Period for Rep						
WHICHEV - Extensions of after SIX (6) - If NO period - Failure to reposition Any reply reconstructions.	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP ER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. For reply is specified above, the maximum statutory periodly within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuted by the Office later than three months after the mail and term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ute, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ Resp	onsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14</u>	September 2005.				
2a)☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
close	ed in accordance with the practice under	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of	Claims					
4a) O 5)	n(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are withdren(s) is/are allowed. n(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. n(s) is/are objected to. n(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.				
Application Pa	apers					
9)∐ The s	pecification is objected to by the Examir	ner.	·			
10) <u></u> The d	lrawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ ac	ccepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
Appli	cant may not request that any objection to th	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
_	acement drawing sheet(s) including the corre bath or declaration is objected to by the f	- ' '				
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure e attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)						
	eferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	•			
3) Information	Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/707,569

Art Unit: 2144

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Morizane does not teach the coordinates of the camera device. However, Morizane teaches it in paragraph [0075]. Regarding claim 20, note that paragraph [0002] teaches how to control the distance between vehicles, which is the same as the range in response of the camera input.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 12, 15-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Morizane et al (2002/0026274).

As per claims 1 and 9, Morizane discloses a single vision sensor having a position with coordinates on the vehicle, detecting at least one object, and generating at least one object detection signal; and a controller coupled to the vision sensor and generating a safety system signal in response to the coordinates and the at least one

Application/Control Number: 10/707,569

Art Unit: 2144

object detection signal (paragraphs [0002]-[0004], [0069], [0079], [0098]-[0100] figures 1-2, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 23, 28).

As per claim 2, it is inherent that in a camera uses a two-dimensional system.

As per claim 3, Morizane discloses the use of a camera (paragraph [0003])

As per claims 4 and 18, Morizane discloses an adaptive cruise control task in response to the safety system signal (paragraph [0003]).

As per claim 6, Morizane discloses the vision sensor relative to a hoodline of the vehicle (figures 2A-2C).

As per claims 7, 15, 16 and 17, Morizane discloses determining the size and upangle of the at least one object and in response thereto determining the range of the at least one object (paragraphs [0004], [0054], figures 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 23, 28).

As per claim 12, Morizane discloses reducing traveling speed of the vehicle when height and width of the object appear to increase in size (figures 1, 2, 1018, 23).

As per claims 11 and 20, Morizane discloses a single vision sensor having a position with coordinates on the vehicle, detecting at least one object detection signal; and a controller coupled to the vision sensor determining size and up-angle of the at least one object in response to the coordinates and the at least one object detection signal, and in response thereto determining range of the at least on object; wherein the controller reduces speed of the vehicle in response to the range (paragraphs [0002]-[0004], [0069], [0079], [0098]-[0100] figures 1-2, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 23, 28).

Application/Control Number: 10/707,569

Art Unit: 2144

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizane et al (2002/0026274) in view of Hirabayashi (5,874,904).

As per claims 5 and 10, Morizane does not teach determining the position of the vision sensor relative to a predetermined reference on the vehicle. However, Hirabayashi teaches determining the position of the vision sensor relative to a predetermined reference on the vehicle (column 1, lines 60-67, column 2, lines 1-13). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Morizane's invention with Hirabayashi's position in order to detect dangerous approach from different vehicles.

As per claim 8, Morizane does not teach a memory coupled to the controller and storing the information regarding the position. However, a memory coupled to a controller is inherent.

As per claims 13 and 14, Morizane does not teach determining object parameters and generating a signal in response to the object parameters. However, Hirabayashi teaches it in column 3, lines 30-53. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Morizane's invention with Hirabayashi's parameters in order to detect dangerous approach from different vehicles.

Art Unit: 2144

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga Hernandez whose telephone number is 571-272-7144. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8:30am-7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Olga Hernandez Examiner

Art Unit 2144